



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/824,355

04/02/2001

Edward J. Gottsman

38836.00.0044

7180

30498

7590

03/27/2009

Vedder Price PC

222 NORTH LASALLE STREET

CHICAGO, IL 60601

EXAMINER

CORRIELUS, JEAN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2162

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/27/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte: EDWARD J. GOTTSMAN

Application No. 09/824,355
Technology Center 2100

Mailed: March 26, 2009

Before KRISTA ZELE *Deputy Chief Appeals Administrator*
ZELE, *Deputy Chief Appeals Administrator*.

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on December 15, 2008. A review of the application revealed that it is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being returned to the Examiner to address the following matter(s) requiring attention prior to docketing.

EXAMINER’S ANSWER,
INCONSISTENCIES WITH THE BRIEF AND/OR
LAST REJECTION OF RECORD

A review of the file finds inconsistencies between the last rejection of record, and corresponding Grounds of Rejection sections in the Appeal Brief and the examiner’s answer as set forth below.

Examiner’s Answer

A review of the Examiner’s Office communication mailed on July 28, 2008, finds that the status of claims is different or unclear as compared to the last rejection of record and/or as compared to the Brief.

Specifically, the Office communication recites that “claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) anticipated by Benson”. However, the previous Office actions and Appellant Brief state the claims are rejected under section 102(b). Furthermore, claim 2 was indicated as allowable in the Examiner’s Answer mailed 7/2/08.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the application be returned to the Examiner to:

(1) review the above inconsistencies to determine how to clarify the record;

(i.) vacate the Examiner's Answer mailed on July 28, 2008, and

(ii.) issue a corrected Examiner's Answer to correct Grounds of Rejection and to correct other sections of the Answer as may be required;

(iii.) to include the necessary approval from the TC Director or designee in accordance with MPEP 1207.05, part (B) as may be required for any new grounds of rejection;

(iv.) for such further action as may be appropriate.

If there are any questions pertaining to this Order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

KZ/gvw

ACCENTURE
C/O VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ, PC
222 NORTH LASALLE STREET
CHICAGO, IL 60601